THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

332
B875
V. 13

THE

CALUMNIOUS ASPERSIONS

CONTAINED IN

The Report

OF THE

SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE STOCK-EXCHANGE,

EXPOSED AND REFUTED,

IN SO FAR AS REGARDS

Lord Cochrane, K. B. and M. P., the Hon. Cochrane Johnstone, M. P.

AND

R. G. Butt, Esq.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED,

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF MR. BUTT,

COPIES OF THE

Purchases and Sales of Omnium and Consols, referred to in the REPORT *of the Sub-Committee.*

FOURTH EDITION.

Tanto est accusare quam defendere,
quanto facere quam sanare vulnera
facilius. QUINCT.

LONDON:

Printed by W. Lewis, St. John's Square;

SOLD BY JONES, NEWGATE-STREET; J. M. RICHARDSON, CORNHILL; STOCKDALE, JUN. PALL-MALL; BUDD, PALL-MALL; AND OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

Price 2s. 6d.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following tract is designed only, as its title imports, to refute "the calumnious aspersions contained in the Report of the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange, on the characters of Lord Cochrane, the Hon. Cochrane Johnstone, and R. G. Butt, Esq." No notice has therefore been taken of the numerous unfounded assertions, which subsequently appeared at different times in some of the public Journals. At no distant period, however, the real circumstances attending the hitherto mysterious transaction which took place on the 21st of February last, must be disclosed before a proper tribunal—when it is confidently trusted, that those who have been led into error, and given—perhaps unconsciously—currency to slander, will not hesitate to repair the injustice they have committed, by a candid retraction of those unfounded statements.

This publication would never have appeared, but that the *ex-parte* statements reiterated in the different Newspapers, added to the aspersions in the Report itself, have thrown such a weight of odium on the parties accused, as to render it imperative to counteract the prejudice that may have been excited, by an exposition of—the TRUTH.

REFUTATION,

&c. &c.

THE desire of maintaining a reputation for honor and integrity, is a feeling implanted in the breast of every individual; it is inherent in the human mind: and the man who is devoid of that essential quality, must be alike hopeless of possessing, as he must be conscious of not meriting, the respect of the community. Hence, attacks upon reputation, as they excite the strongest sensibilities of our nature, have at all times been held in civilized society, as demanding more decisive proof than accusation, in which matter of fact only is involved. Nor ought it to create surprise, if, under an impulse of resentment, the individual who feels himself assailed by unfounded imputation, should repel the charge, in terms distinguished rather by natural feelings, than regard to that respectful deference which public controversy may perhaps be deemed to claim.

In appealing to the justice, and impartiality of the community, it may be observed as the distinguishing characteristic of this country, that persons suffering under calumny, seldom fail of meeting liberal consideration. And if unhappily they do not succeed in dispelling *prejudice*, an appeal to public candour, at least, silences the hasty censures of premature decision.

That an imposition so gross as the one lately practised upon the Stock-Exchange, should rouse the resentment of that body, will be deemed consonant with the feelings of those concerned in that species of traffic. But, that individuals should have been selected as the perpetrators, for no other apparent reason, than that they have become speculators without the sanction of *the house*, does not appear consistent, with either common sense, or comuon justice. The Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange have, however, not hesitated publicly to advance a charge against LORD COCHRANE, the HON. COCHRANE JOHNSTONE, and MR. R. G. BUTT, as the persons with whom originated, the contrivance, and execution, of what is known by the vulgar epithet of "*The Stock-Exchange hoax.*"

Of this calumny, the two former gentlemen have already published, what in the minds of the dispassionate, and the unprejudiced, is deemed a satisfactory and convincing refutation. MR. BUTT, however, fortified by conscious integrity, has not hitherto gone beyond the simple, unequivocal denial of the fact imputed to him, either as a party, or as having been in any wise privy to the contrivance, or the execution of the fraud.

So far from seeking to silence or evade enquiry, these three gentlemen, as well befits individuals holding their rank and station in society, have anxiously courted investigation; and failing to receive from the Sub-Committee, that justice which might have been expected, they had instructed their

solicitors to make application to the Court of King's Bench for redress against open attack, aggravated as it has been by insinuation. But, most fortunately, the Sub-Committee have, at length, themselves, resorted to a legal procedure, by which the individuals who have been calumniated will be thus afforded an opportunity of more speedily proving their integrity, than could have been obtained by that course of law to which they had prepared to resort.

Amidst the multifarious productions of the press, it is beyond hope that the public can be apprized of the discordant statements—the mutilated facts—and isolated arguments, that have been put forth upon this subject. To bring the circumstances of the case into a clear and perspicuous point of view, therefore, becomes essential to the right understanding of a question, in which the characters of individuals are so imminently involved.

The facts relating to the fraud, as they are detailed by the Sub-Committee, will, therefore, be first stated; and every other point connected with it, will be successively brought to view, in the order in which they have been laid before the public. Upon these will be made observations, supported by facts; and the aggregate of information, thus brought into one focus, left to the decision of such as may feel an interest in the developement of this mysterious transaction. The substance of the information said to have been collected by the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange, was communi-

cated to the public in a Report, of which the following is an extract.

"It appears in evidence, from the examination of various parties, and is already well-known to the public, that a person representing himself to be Colonel R. Du Bourgh, Aide-de-Camp to Lord Cathcart, came to the Ship Inn, at Dover, about one o'clock, on the morning of the 21st of February. He stated, that he had just arrived from the coast of France; that he brought the intelligence that Bonaparte had been slain in battle; that the allied armies were in Paris; and that peace was certain. He immediately ordered a post-chaise and four to be got ready; and after having dispatched a letter to Admiral Foley, at Deal, communicating to him the above information, with a view to its being forwarded to government by the telegraph, set off with all expedition to London. This pretended messenger has been traced all the way to town, and it appears, that, about a quarter before nine o'clock, he arrived at Marsh-gate, Lambeth, where he alighted, and got into a hackney-coach, in which he was taken to No. 13, Green-street, Grosvenor-square.

"It likewise appears in evidence, from the examination of various persons, that (whilst this grand plot was carrying on from Dover to London) a sort of under-plot was also carrying on from North Fleet to London. For, on the same morning, a person of the name of Ralph Sandom, who had absented himself from the rules of the King's-Bench, set off from North Fleet, in company with two other persons dressed as foreigners, in a post-chaise to Dartford. When they arrived there, they got into a post-chaise and four for London. They decked the horses with laurel, and directing the post-boys to drive over London-bridge and through the city, they circulated on their way the same news as the pretended Du Bourgh at Dover. The chaise passed over Blackfriars-bridge, and stopped also within a short distance of the Marsh-gate."

This imposition, which was in a very few hours detected, naturally drew forth expressions of indig-

nation from all the public prints, against the authors, whoever they might be, and consequently increased the abhorrence felt by the community at large. The Stock-Exchange, as being chiefly interested, were looked to for a developement of the mystery, and the public mind certainly anticipated from that source, a candid statement of the circumstances attaching to the fraud.

That body, accordingly, endeavoured to find out, as they allege in their Report, which has been published, "the principal agents in this disgraceful and dishonourable transaction,"—which Report it will be necessary to investigate, passage by passage. But it may be proper, previously, to exhibit some of the paragraphs inserted in the public prints, in order to bespeak, as it might seem, a confidence in its accuracy.

"THE INFAMOUS IMPOSITION.

"We are glad to hear that a Special Meeting of the gentlemen belonging to the Stock-Exchange was appointed to be held yesterday afternoon, which, it is to be hoped, will be the means of detecting and bringing to justice the principals and agents inplicated in the nefarious transaction of Monday. It has been ascertained, that one broker purchased for his employers, in the early part of Monday forenoon, the enormous sum of six hundred and fifty thousand in omnium, which purchase, it is estimated, on a moderate calculation, produced a net profit of sixteen thousand pounds. The whole amount of the transfers, in the course of the day, it is said, exceeded a million and a half. The report of the Committee of Inquiry is expected with much anxiety; and we trust they will proceed till they bring the delinquents to justice, and to that exemplary punishment which will deter others from following their example in future. We take it for granted, that all bargains founded on this fraud will be cancelled, as on former

occasions. The bank-notes disposed of by the impostor on his way to town, are indorsed by a mercantile house in town—a circumstance which may lead to the discovery of the author or authors of the infamous fraud."—*Morning Post, Feb.* 23.

"The Committee of the gentlemen of the Stock-Exchange, appointed to endeavour to trace out the authors of the infamous fraud of Monday, have prosecuted the enquiry with the most unremitting assiduity; and, at the close of their sittings on Saturday, a mass of evidence had been collected, which must infallibly lead to a complete discovery of the principal actors in the transaction."—*Morning Post, Feb.* 28.

"The infamous arts practised on Monday, to give an artificial lift to the Funds, have justly excited great and general indignation, and we learn, with peculiar satisfaction, that there is every well-grounded hope of the speedy and complete detection of the parties who planned and executed the conspiracy. Government are said to have discovered the principal agents employed in the nefarious imposition practised upon the public on Monday last, and we have no doubt they have received information sufficient to enable them to form a pretty accurate opinion in what quarter this infamous transaction originated. The Committee of the Stock-Exchange, after some discussion, have come to a resolution not to cancel the bargains made on Monday in consequence of the infamous hoax practised upon the public, leaving the parties injured to such legal remedies as the disclosure of the fraud may admit. The Committee likewise resolved, that a delegation, or select number of subscribers, called "The Committee for the protection of property against frauds," should meet yesterday at 12 o'clock, for the discovery and punishment of the principals and agents concerned in the flagrant imposition, the circumstances of which were fully and correctly detailed in our last. The Committee has commenced its sittings, and from the information which had been collected from Deal, Dover, Northfleet, and the intermediate towns, no doubt is entertained but the result of the investigation will lead to the detection and punishment of the delinquents."

"We are glad to hear the Committee of the Stock-Exchange have made considerable progress in discovering the authors of the late nefarious fraud, and that they have ascertained that the pretended Colonel Du Bourgh went to the house of a gentleman who has a large stock-jobbing account. Though the Committee have posted the following notice, yet we should hope that the gentlemen named therein were no parties to the deception practised. They cannot, however, take too early an opportunity of clearing themselves from all suspicion of having participated in the transaction :—

"*Stock Exchange Committee Room, March* 4.

"It is particularly requested, &c. (See below.*)—*Morning Post, March* 7.

"It is said that the Napoleons paid away on the road, by the mysterious traveller, were purchased of Binns and Co., and paid by a draft on a banker, from a noble lord."—*Morning Chronicle.*

[See the answer to this assertion, Appendix, N°. 5.]

"The Stock Exchange Hoax.—The Committee of the Stock-Exchange appointed to inquire into the late *Hoax*, practised for the purpose of influencing the funds, have ascertained that the largest purchases made on that day were for the persons hereinafter named, and the following notice was on Friday posted up at the Stock-Exchange :—

'*Committee-Room, March* 4, 1814.

* 'It is particularly requested that all those members of the Stock-Exchange who transacted business, either directly or indirectly, for any of the persons under-mentioned, on Monday, the 21st of February last, will favour the Committee with an interview :—

Hon. Cochrane Johnstone.	Mr. Holloway
Mr. R. G. Butt.	Mr. Sandon.
Lord Cochrane.	Mr. Mac Rae.

"The investigation is now going on, and much, it is thought, will be brought to light."

"STOCK-JOBBING.—A reward of 250*l.* has been publicly advertised by the Committee of the Stock-Exchange, for the discovery of Colonel Du Bourg, the principal agent of the parties concerned in the late nefarious stock-jobbing transactions. We mentioned, on Friday last, that the Committee had posted the names of six gentlemen, presumed to be directly or indirectly concerned in the above affair. From motives of delicacy we refrained from publishing them; and although they have since been given in several papers, we do not feel ourselves justified in following that example."—*Statesman.*

"The Committee of the Stock-Exchange has made out its Report upon the subject of the late infamous fraud, which will immediately be published.

"The Committee have, by invitation, waited on Lord Melville; and, it is understood, a Noble Lord, whose name has been frequently mentioned in the investigation of this business, was also requested to attend Lord Melville at the same time."—*Morning Post, March* 9.

"The gentlemen composing the Special Committee of the Stock-Exchange came, on Wednesday, to a resolution to print the Report of their Inquiry into the late nefarious transaction. We understand that there was at first a difference of opinion among the members on this subject, some doubting the propriety of publishing the Report, while others maintain, that it is the duty of the house to make a full disclosure of all the authors and abettors of the imposition, and of all the circumstances connected with it, as the most effectual means of guarding the public against a recurrence of such disgraceful practices. In the end, however, the Committee, by a great majority, confirmed the resolution for printing the Report."—*Morning Post, March* 11.

The public mind was thus *prepared to believe*—first, that the Stock-Exchange would accurately and disinterestedly investigate the facts—and next, that having so done, those individuals, to whom allusion

was so indecorously made were parties on whom suspicion attached.

On the 7th of March the Sub-Committee issued their "REPORT," which is here transcribed verbatim, though in detached passages, in order more effectually to expose their fallacy. Reference must, however, necessarily be had to what has been already published in the Affidavit of Lord Cochrane; not only because what is therein affirmed, and the observations made upon it, may not have been generally read, but because, to make the matter perfectly plain, all that has been said upon the different points ought to be collected into one focus.

The Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange, after having explained in their "REPORT" the particular manner in which the fraud was practised (see page 4), thus proceed:—

"The Sub-Committee, for various reasons which it is unnecessary here to allude to, refrain from making any observations on the evidence which they have obtained relative to this subject. They therefore communicate it without a single *comment*. Their only object has been, to endeavour to find out the principal agents in this disgraceful and dishonourable transaction; and they are happy to state, that there is every reason to hope that the chain of evidence which they have been enabled to obtain, will finally lead to a full discovery of the offending parties; at the same time they have the satisfaction of being able to declare, that it does not appear that any Member of the Stock-Exchange has been implicated in the knowledge or participation of a measure, which would have, inevitably, rendered him liable to expulsion from the House.

"It is unnecessary here to state the time and attention

which the Sub-Committee have devoted to the investigation of this subject. They cannot, however, refrain from noticing the great difficulties and delay which they have experienced in obtaining information on those points, which would have enabled them to have brought their labours to a more speedy and complete issue; for though they have had every means of assistance voluntarily rendered to them by his Majesty's Government, and by the Bank of England, in those cases where it was very essential and desirable, yet having no legal power to compel the attendance of persons, whose evidence would have been of the greatest importance, they have been obliged to resort to a more indirect mode of procuring the information on which their Report is founded.

"Although the Sub-Committee, in thus presenting the result of their labours, may be considered as virtually dissolved, yet they beg leave to state, that they are ready and willing to continue their exertions, as long as they may be considered necessary. They are in possession of still further information on the subject, which it is considered proper not to disclose at present, and which they hope and expect will eventually crown their efforts with complete success.

"Charles Laurence, Chairman.
Charles Nairne, Deputy-Chairman.
Benjamin Oakley.
Lewis Andrew De Le Chaumette.
Christopher Terry.
Francis Wakefield.
Francis Bailey.
John Lewis.
John Capel.
William Hammond."

Upon this part of the Committee's Report little more need be said, than that what is called "Evidence" is, by their own statement, the substance of private enquiries, unsupported by oath; that they

have, nevertheless, by direct implication, held forth Lord Cochrane, Mr. C. Johnstone, and Mr. Butt, as the authors of, and gainers by, the imposition; and, in affirming themselves to be "in possession of still further information on the subject, which it is considered proper not to disclose," they evidently design, that the intelligence thus affected to be withheld, should be inferred to possess greater importance than they knew it to merit, even *had any been really in their possession to withhold.*

"*Minutes of Evidence.*"

"THOMAS SHILLING stated, that he is a post-boy at the Marquis of Granby Inn, at Dartford; that he took up a person about half-past seven o'clock on Monday morning, February the 21st; that he drove the wheel horses; that when the gentleman got into the chaise, the waiter asked him if he knew of any news, to which he replied, that "it was all over;" that when the waiter asked him what he meant by its being *all over*, he said that Bonaparte was torn in a thousand pieces, and that the Cossacks fought for a share of him; that, at the same time he said this, he was in the chaise; that he ordered the post-boys to drive fast, and that they accordingly did drive very fast for the first three miles, but when they came to Bexley Heath, he told them they need not drive so fast; that he said his business was not so particular now, since he thought the telegraphs could not work; Shilling replied, that he was sure they could not, as he knew all the telegraphs; that the gentleman then looked out of the chaise-window, and said, "Post-boy, you need not mention the news as you go along;" to which Shilling replied, "I shall not, Sir, unless you desire it," and at the same time asked him what the news was; the gentleman then told him exactly what he had stated to the waiter, with these additional circumstances, that he

came ashore within two miles of Dover, the Frenchmen being afraid to come nearer; that he came from the place where he landed to the Ship Inn, at Dover, and left it at two o'clock in the morning; that he had sent the intelligence to the Port Admiral at Deal, in order that the telegraph might be worked, and that he was obliged to do so; the gentleman then said no more to the post-boys till they got to Shooter's-hill, when they dismounted, and walked by the side of the horses; he gave them out of the chaise part of a bottle of wine, and some biscuits, and said to Shilling, "Post-boy, I think I shall take a hackney-coach;" Shilling told him the first hackney-coach stand was at the Bricklayer's-Arms; he replied, "I shall not get out there, that won't do," and asked if there was not a coach-stand in Lambeth-road, and desired him to drive on to that place, as the chaise would go faster than a coach; at the same time the gentleman told Shilling, that he need not mention any thing as he *went on*, but that on *returning* he might mention it to whom he pleased. When they came to the Stags at Lambeth, there was no coach there; the gentleman then drew up the side blind of the chaise (at the corner where he sat), as if to hide himself, and the post-boys drove on to Marsh-gate; they stopped at the side of a hackney-coach standing there, and *on the chaise-door and coach-door being opened, the gentleman got into the coach and drove off*, after having given a gold Napoleon to each of the drivers; Shilling asked the waterman where the gentleman ordered the coachman to drive, and he replied, "to Grosvenor-square." Shilling described the gentleman as having a large *red nose*, large whiskers, *face rather blotched*, and that when he spoke his eyes seemed to catch; he thinks him *about* the height of Sayer, the police-officer, but not quite so tall or so lusty; he had on a brown surtout, and a red coat under it, a brown fur cap, with something like *silver* lace on it; he had also a sword and a small portmanteau, which were laid on the seat of the chaise; he paid for the chaise at Dartford, and ordered it to drive to Downing-street. Shilling says he has no doubt but that he should know him again."

As the narrative, termed "*Evidence*," of THOMAS SHILLING, is closely connected with that recorded by the Sub-Committee, with equal propriety, as the "*Evidence*" of WILLIAM CRANE, the hackney-coachman, and derives its assumed importance solely from the connection supposed to subsist between them, the remarks upon both must, of necessity, be blended. It may, however, be first proper to suggest, whether it might not have been deemed a matter of material import to the public, as well as justice to the parties accused, if the Sub-Committee had explained why the *second Post-boy*, who is wholly unnoticed, was not also examined; and the more particularly, as the Sub-Committee afterwards themselves appear to have doubted the fact, which CRANE and SHILLING were designed to establish, as will appear by the following statement (taken from the public prints), giving another route to the pretended Du Bourgh.

"THE LATE STOCK-EXCHANGE HOAX.—The following information with regard to the finding of the uniform and insignia supposed to have been worn by the pretended Colonel Du Bourgh, was on Saturday posted at the Stock-Exchange :—

'*Committee-Room, March* 26.

'The Sub-Committee inform the members of the Stock-Exchange, that a waterman has just brought to them a bundle which he dragged up from the bottom of the River Thames, on the 23d instant, containing a scarlet regimental coat, cut up into very small pieces, together with an embroidered silver star, and the silver badge of some Order. The coat has plain gilt buttons, and appears to have been trimmed with blue and

with gold embroidery. The star had a red cross in the middle, surmounted by two angels supporting a crown, and surrounded by the following motto, worked in silver twist, on a red ground:—AMAM: JUS: PIET: FIDEM. The badge appears to belong to some Order of Masonry, and consists of a silver radiated cross, having an eagle on one side, and a pelican feeding her young (affixed to a compass) on the other. The whole of the above, together with several pieces of old lead and brass, were tied up in the cover of a white chair cushion, evidently for the purpose of being sunk. As the pretended Col. Du Bourgh is said to have worn a dress similar to the above on the 21st ult. and as there has been an evident attempt in this transaction at concealment, the Sub-Committee will be obliged to any member of this House who may be able to procure any information relative to this subject. —*Day*, *March* 28.

"*Minutes of Evidence*" *continued.*

William Crane stated, that he is the driver of the hackney-coach, No. 890; that he took up on Monday, February 21, at about forty minutes past eight o'clock in the morning, at the Marsh-gate, *a gentleman who had just alighted from a Dartford chaise and four;* that he was directed to drive to No. 13, Green-street, Grosvenor-square, where the gentleman alighted, and knocking at the door, inquired for *Colonel* or *Captain*— (the coachman did not hear the name) and was told by the servant that he was gone to breakfast in Cumberland-street; that on receiving this reply, the gentleman asked if he could write a note to him, and on being answered in the affirmative, he went into the parlour, apparently for that purpose; that he took his portmanteau and sword in his hand, and laid them down as if familiar with the house, and on Crane's asking him for more money, he came to the parlour-door and gave him another shilling;—that Crane then left him in the house, and the door being shut, he drove away; that he should know the house again to which he drove, and also that he should know the gentleman again by his speech;—that he looked like a fo-

reigner, had a cough, and was a *red-faced man*, about the middle size:—that he had on a brown great coat with a red coat under it, and a fur cap with *gold lace;*—that the servant who opened the door was a short man, rather elderly, and dressed in black clothes.

In this "evidence" of Crane, it is not difficult to discover many discrepancies and contradictions, between his depositions and those of Shilling (which they are designed to support) that may convince the most superficial reader of the non-identity of the pretended Du Bourgh with Captain De Berenger. And first it ought to be kept in mind, that this man, who was *not examined upon oath, might* be so far influenced by the expectation of reward, as to endeavour to make his statement accord as nearly as possible with that of the post-boy.

In the account given by the latter, it is minutely detailed, that "the post-boys drove on to the Marsh-gate. They stopped at the side of a hackney-coach, standing there, *and on the chaise-door and coach-door being opened, the gentleman got into the coach and drove off;*" i. e. in plain terms, that the gentleman, wishing to elude public observation, stepped directly from the coach. That concealment was an object of paramount importance with the pretended Du Bourgh, is indeed manifest; because, to use the words of Shilling, just before quitting the chaise, "the gentleman drew up the side-blind, (at the corner where he sat,) as if to hide himself." And yet, it is affirmed by Crane, that he "*took up*, at the

Marsh-gate, *a gentleman* who had just *alighted* from a Dartford chaise and four!"—that is, the gentleman had quitted the chaise, and regardless of his former design of eluding observation, appeared on the public road until he procured a coach, which, with the like suddenly-inspired confidence, he boldly ordered to drive to a house whither he might be traced, without the slightest difficulty!! Thus, if we believe the "*evidences*" of both these witnesses as applicable to the same person—the "*gentleman*" must have been particularly careful to conceal himself *while in the chaise*, and have become suddenly regardless of concealment, by exposing his whole person to public view, by *alighting from the chaise.*

CRANE says, he received orders from *the gentleman he took up*, to drive him to *Green-street*, where he alighted, "and knocking at the door, enquired for Colonel or Captain ——." Now, who could be meant by this "colonel" or "captain," it were fruitless to conjecture. That a man could ask for LORD COCHRANE by any other title than *Lord*, is utterly inconsistent with probability; and the sound of "*colonel*," or of "*captain*" bears no resemblance to that of *lord.* To reconcile this remarkable discrepancy is impossible, unless it could be shewn that LORD COCHRANE's servants were prepared for the visit; that they were informed their master would be so enquired for; and that they subsequently swore to falsehood, in order to screen his Lordship from the fraud.

Again, Crane describes the gentleman *he* drove,

to have "had on a brown great-coat with a red-coat underneath it," which are nearly the words of Shilling; but Crane also states, that *his* gentleman had a brown fur-cap, "with *gold* lace," whereas the one driven by Shilling is alleged to have worn "a brown fur-cap, with something like *silver* lace!" The *trifling* difference between *gold* and *silver* would not perhaps be worthy of remark, but that it shews the curious construction of Crane's memory, which could not recollect whether the gentleman asked for a *colonel* or a *captain*, nor whether the gentleman's cap was ornamented with a *yellow* or a *white* metal, and yet so minutely remembered, that the servant said the "colonel" or "captain was gone to *Cumberland-street*."

That Shilling and Crane should have so nearly agreed in their assertions, would doubtless appear extraordinary, were it not recollected that the latter would be unable to prove his title to the reward, unless he made his statement accord with that of Shilling. But presuming, for the sake of argument, that the person driven by Crane did wear the clothes described, that would rather prove, that such gentleman never called at the house of Lord Cochrane; for in opposition to the bare unsworn statement of a hackney-coachman, we have the *oaths* of Lord Cochrane, three of his servants, and of the two servants of Baron de Berenger. (See Appendix, A, B, & 9 and 10.) Lordship says, in his affidavit, "I most positively swear, that I never saw any person at my house resembling the description and in the dress stated in

the printed advertisement of the members of the Stock-Exchange," and that "CAPTAIN BERENGER," (when his Lordship returned home, on being sent for by him,) "wore a grey-coat, a green uniform and a military cap." His Lordship's servants, *Thomas Dewman*, *Isaac Davis*, and *Mary Turpin*, agree on oath with this part of the affidavit.—(See Appendix, Nos. 1, 2, and 3.)

CRANE states, that the gentleman he drove "was a red-faced man;" Shilling also says, that he had "a large red nose," and "face rather blotched." Now, it is well-known that CAPTAIN BERENGER bore no resemblance to such description, he being *pale*, marked with the small-pox, and free from blotches!

Continuation of "Minutes of Evidence."

Mr. SAYER, the police officer in attendance, stated, that on Saturday, February 26, he went with William Crane, the hackney-coachman, to Green-street, in order to identify the house. When they arrived there, he desired the coachman to knock at the door, and (under some pretence) to inquire for the gentleman whom he had set down there on Monday. He did so, but was answered from the area, that the gentleman did not live there, that Mr. Durand did live there, but that he had just left it; that the family now residing there was Lord Cochrane's, and that they came in only on Friday last. Sayer asked the coachman if he had any recollection of the servant; he replied, that it was not the same footman who opened the door here on Monday when the gentleman alighted.

At a subsequent examination, Mr. Sayer stated, that he had obtained information in the neighbourhood, that Mr. Durand left No. 13, Green-street, on Wednesday, February 16, and that Lord Cochrane came in a day or two afterwards.

Mr. Sayer being instructed to obtain the most correct information upon this subject, stated, at another examination, that

he had ascertained that Lord Cochrane came into the house, No. 13, Green-street, on Thursday, Feb. 17, but that it is uncertain whether Mr. Durand slept there that night or not; he likewise stated, that he had ascertained that Lord Cochrane, his brother, and three or four more men, live in the house; that the man-servant had been turned off, and another hired; that the servant who let in the pretended Du Bourgh is sent into the country; that the maid-servant is not allowed to be seen or spoken to; that the house is Mr. Durand's, who has let it (furnished) to Lord Cochrane; that Mrs. Durand has been seen to wear such a cap as the one which the pretended Du Bourgh is said to have worn.

Perhaps no part of this extraordinary "evidence" presents a more glaring picture of the wanton and prejudiced conduct of the Stock-Exchange Committee, than the statements attributed to SAYER, the police officer. Let the reader but peruse attentively the concluding sentence of the last examination of SAYER, and we may challenge him to produce a climax of arrogant assumption more monstrous and malevolent. He "had ascertained, that Lord Cochrane, his brother, and *three or four more men*, live in the house; that the man-servant had been turned off and another hired; that the servant who *let in the pretended* DU BOURGH is sent into the country; that the maid-servant is not allowed to be seen or spoken to; that the house is MR. DURAND'S, who has let it (furnished) to Lord Cochrane; that Mrs. Durand has been seen to wear such a cap as the one which the pretended Du Bourgh is said to have worn!"

The peculiar coarseness of the expressions attributed to SAYER, is truly illustrative of the whole

tenor of the proceedings adopted by this self-constituted tribunal. Nor will the reader forget to remark the *elegant* phrase "that Lord Cochrane, his brother, and *three or four more men* lodged in the house," as applied to a member of the Senate, and one who had signalized himself in the service of his country. Language more gross could not possibly have been used, had the police-officer actually sought *conspirators* against the State—instead of the Sub-Committee having merely employed a Bow-street officer, to stimulate the accusation of masters by their servants, and ransack chandlers-shops and pot-houses in order to "ascertain," by such low and disgraceful means, whether some circumstances could not be picked up from their proverbial and calumnious loquacity, which might be twisted into a link of this mighty "chain of evidence." The explanation given by some persons of the fact of "*three or four more men*" living in the house is, that on the question being put whether any more men resided in it besides his Lordship—of course the answer would be in the affirmative, although the police-officer can hardly be supposed to have done otherwise than ascertain, that the said "three or four men" were Lord Cochrane's servants! Why the fact was not so explained in the "Minutes of Evidence," can only be *conjectured!*

That no *other* "men" did live in the house, is, however, proved beyond a doubt, and will hardly *now* be contradicted by the Sub-Committee, although

it may be supposed they will attempt, by insinuation, to give some other colouring than the true one, to vindicate the passage. The fact is, that the "three or four more men" were *intended* to have been understood by the public, as Mr. Cochrane Johnstone, Mr. Butt, and Captain De Berenger—not any one of whom had ever been in the house prior to the 21st of February.

The public took the hint as was designed, and conceiving that this implied *fellowship* could not arise from ordinary pursuits, naturally concluded Lord Cochrane's house to have been the general rendezvous of conspiracy. Without this assumed close connection, indeed, neither Mr. C. JOHNSTONE, nor Mr. BUTT, could be implicated as parties; and *that* the COMMITTEE found necessary for their purpose, because, his Lordship's dealings in the funds at that period appeared, even in their own conviction, too trifling to warrant the *suspicion* of fraudulent conduct in any man, much less in one of his Lordship's high rank, honour, and well-known probity.

The consolidation of two or three other accounts would, however, make this part of the design more easy of execution. Hence, when the first link of the intended "*chain of evidence*" was formed, it was easy to add other links—such as the joint office stated to have been hired without Mr. Fearn's knowledge—that Mr. Butt acted as the agent of Lord Cochrane—and that they met constantly, all

three together, in the city, to consult, particularly on the day of the fraud. All this has been proved on oath to be *false*, together with a variety of other circumstances, which uncandid ingenuity could readily suggest.

But to proceed:—*Sayer* says, "that the man-servant had been sent away, and another hired." If by this servant is meant the one who was dismissed after the customary month's warning (see Appendix, No. 2), why was it not so explained in the "Minutes of Evidence"? But there is no difficulty in perceiving that a different implication was intended, which was well calculated to mislead the judgment of the public. That this deceptive meaning was designed, is evident from the words which follow, "that the servant who let in the pretended Du Bourgh *is sent* into the country."

To account for this circumstance is perfectly easy. That the servant is *implied* as put out of the way, to avoid his disclosing what was meant to be imputed as being known by him, is too obvious to admit of misconstruction; but lest it might not be so understood, the words of this part of *Sayer*'s alleged "evidence," are perhaps unguardedly positive in the assertion, *that the pretended Du Bourgh was actually let into Lord Cochrane's house!* This is a most fortunate disclosure, that the design of the Stock-Exchange Committee was unequivocally to charge his Lordship and his friends with the fraud; and may, if the law could not otherwise reach the calumny, be of infinite importance.

The " Evidence," in the hope of avoiding results they knew they merited, in general cautiously abstained from any explicit charge. But although their Report was affirmed to have been printed for the *sole* use of the Committee, by some means or other, it was next day published in all the newspapers. They gave the " evidence," as they say, " without comment:" in short, they endeavoured to inflict their deadly wound, with safety to themselves. Yet disgraceful as is such an attempt, the laws of this country, it is confidently trusted, will not suffer them to be sheltered by such means, but will consider all this artifice as a high aggravation of their offence. A complete refutation of the implication thrown out as to the absence of the two servants, will however be found (see Appendix, 1 & 2); as will also that which alludes to other parts of Sayer's " evidence." With regard to the statement, " that the maid-servant is not allowed to be seen or spoken to," little need be said. That this female should have refused to subject herself to the rough and intrusive interrogatories of any unknown person, must be highly gratifying to every liberal mind. No family of respectability could permit such impertinency, especially if aware that the object was, to extract, and then torture into an assumed importance, any replies that might have been obtained—as had been done with regard to the " three or four more men," previously noticed in this same " evidence" of SAYER.

"*Minutes of Evidence*" *continued.*

"Mr. Laurence (Chairman of the Committee) stated, that he had been to Messrs. Bond and Co. bankers, and had ascertained that the four one-pound bank-notes which the pretended Du Bourgh is said to have paid away to the landlord of the Ship Inn, Dover, together with another one-pound note which he had paid away on the road, were in their hands between the hours of one or two o'clock on Saturday, the 19th of February. On being asked whether they could tell to whom they had paid away any quantity of two-pound notes after that time on Saturday, they said they could not without a great deal of trouble, but that if Mr. Laurence would mention the name of any person, they would turn to their account, and endeavour to ascertain the fact. He requested them to see if any check of Mr. Fearn's was paid on that day, wholly or in part, in one-pound notes; but it did not appear that any of his checks were paid in that way. One of the clerks, however, stated, that between three or four o'clock on that day, Mr. Thomas Christmas, a clerk to Mr. Fearn, requested to have fifty one-pound notes in exchange for four ten-pound notes and two five-pound notes, which were accordingly given to him.

"Mr. Thomas Christmas stated, that he was a clerk to Mr. Fearn, but could not recollect having exchanged the notes in question: he, however, said that he would not take his oath that he did *not*. After much hesitation and apparent unwillingness, he at length acknowledged that he had exchanged the four ten-pound and two five-pound notes for Mr. Butt, to whom he delivered the fifty one-pound notes.

"Mr. Glover, from the Bank of England, investigator of bank-notes, stated, that the four ten-pound bank-notes which had been delivered by Mr. Butt to Thomas Christmas, in order to get exchanged, were paid on February 16, by Messrs. Bond and Co. in part of the value of a draft for 75*l.* drawn by Mr. Fearn, and payable to Mr. Butt."

The whole of the above information stated to have been derived from Mr. *Laurence*, Mr. *Christ-*

mas, and Mr. *Glover*, relates to the four one-pound notes which, to use Mr. Laurence's words, "the pretended Du Bourgh is *said to have paid away* to the landlord of the Ship Inn, Dover, together with another one-pound note which he had paid away on the road."

The vague reports, and indecisive facts, from which the Sub-Committee have composed their "evidence" are so manifest in every feature of their report, as to preclude the necessity of much observation. With respect to the bank-notes, from which it is sedulously, but futilely endeavoured to identify Mr. Butt as concerned in the fraud,—nothing appears to countenance that unwarrantable supposition. This "evidence" of Mr. Laurence merely speaks of "four one-pound bank-notes which the pretended Du Bourgh is *said to have paid* away to the landlord of the Ship Inn, Dover"!!—"Is *said* to have paid away"! Will it be credited, that a Committee, *chosen* from any body of men, should ever allude to a circumstance founded on ground no more substantial than what "*is said?*" How can the Sub-Committee account for the inconsistency of the fictitious Du Bourgh, who pretending that he had just come from *France*, gave Napoleons to ignorant post-boys, and yet previously, as "*it is said,*" changed *English* bank-notes at Dover, where the Napoleons would necessarily have had ten times the effect, and where the producing such notes must have tended to create suspicion!

By this "evidence" of Mr. Laurence, it will be perceived that the notes "*said*" to have been paid

away, were in the hands of the bankers in London, between the hours of one and two o'clock on the 19th instant; and that about three or four o'clock on that day, Mr. Christmas, one of Mr. Fearn's clerks, was paid fifty one-pound notes, in exchange for four ten and two five-pound notes. Now what but an overstrained desire of charging Mr. Butt could possibly have induced such an insinuation? Mark the fact:—the bankers had the four one-pound notes in their possession between one and two o'clock—at least it is so "*said*"—and about three or four o'clock they pay away fifty to Mr. Christmas, on account of Mr. Butt. Had no other persons, then, in the intervening hours, received any one-pound notes; and might they not, through those channels, have passed to Dover, or any other part of the kingdom? Can the Committee of the Stock-Exchange seriously think, that it is to be concluded that the *four notes* must necessarily have formed a part of the *fifty?* Those who know the extent of banking concerns, will look upon suspicions thus upheld, as self-defeated. But the Sub-Committee, supposing possibly that this obvious fact would not be much scrutinized, *have* boldly implied that Mr. Butt *must* have received them, because thus only could they form any link of connection between that Gentleman and Lord Cochrane, whose "agent" they falsely assume him to have been.

Conscious, however, that even with this artful and insidious mode of wording Mr. Laurence's "evidence," no man of clear judgment could be de-

ceived by it, they add the "*evidence*" of Mr. Christmas, and pretend that it was not until "after much hesitation and *apparent unwillingness* he at length ackowledged that he had exchanged the four ten-pound and two five-pound notes for Mr. Butt," for the purpose of implying, that he wished to conceal that unimportant fact—thereby intending to impress upon the public mind, that CHRISTMAS also was an accessary to the fraud.

Mr. Christmas's affidavit (see Appendix, No. 7,) will explain the cause of any *apparent* "hesitation;" and will satisfactorily shew, even if any "*hesitation*" did appear, that it was natural for *a youth of seventeen* (which the Sub-Committee omit to mention) to be confused, at being interrogated by so formidable a body, as the Sub-Committee must have appeared to the clerk of a stock-broker. Mr. GLOVER's evidence is of no moment. That the ten-pound notes he paid, were for Mr. Butt, is not intended to be disputed; but that, when exchanged into *ones*, those *alleged* to have been passed by the pretended Du Bourgh formed a part of them, will demand something to be advanced, more consistent with probability than the Sub-Committee have attempted to offer. (See Appendix, No. 8; which is extremely important, even admitting that the notes did actually come to his hands). That they have done all they could, however, is obvious; for, excepting in one or two other flagrant instances hereafter to be noticed, their mode of wording this "*evidence*" is deceptive beyond all precedent.

"*Minutes of Evidence*" *continued.*

"Mr. Joseph Fearn, a stockbroker, stated, that he knew Lord Cochrane, the Hon. A. C. Johnstone, and Mr. R. G. Butt; that he had been in the habit of transacting business for each of them in the public funds; that on the morning of the 21st of February he sold, for various persons, Consols and Omnium to a very large amount—in the whole about 928,000*l.* Of this sum there were sold for

	Omnium.	Consols.
Lord Cochrane - - -	£139,000	None.
Hon. A. C. Johnstone -	120,000	£100,000
Mr. Butt - - - - -	154,000	168,000

most of which had been purchased in the course of the week preceding; that Mr. Butt often acts for Lord Cochrane, in his instructions to buy and sell stock, and that such bargains are always acknowledged as correct by Lord Cochrane; that Lord Cochrane, Mr. Cochrane Johnstone, and Mr. Butt, were with him by ten o'clock in the morning* of the 21st of February; that Mr. Cochrane Johnstone took an office for him in Shorter's-court, next door to the Stock-Exchange, without his knowledge, and that he entered it on the morning of the 21st of February; that although he sold a great deal of stock on that day, yet (with the exception of the three names above-mentioned) he did not sell for any one person above 55,000*l.*; that Lord Cochrane bought 20,000*l.* of the Omnium above-mentioned on Saturday, February 19, and Mr. Cochrane Johnstone bought 60,000*l.* of it on Friday, February 18; that he thinks Mr. Cochrane Johnstone and Mr. Butt acted in concert on Monday, February 21, although at other times they have occasionally acted different ways in the purchase and sale of stock; that the whole of the above business was done for the next settling days, and not for money.

Mr. Hichens, a stockbroker, was sent for; but it being understood he was confined to his bed with a severe fit of illness, Mr. Wakefield, one of the Sub-Committee, waited upon

* That this was not an unusual hour for these gentlemen to visit Mr. Fearn, is evident from Appendix 11 and 12.

him, and learned from him, that although he had known Mr. Cochrane Johnstone for some years, yet he had not done any business for him in the public funds before the present year: that about the 8th of February he began to make some purchases in Omnium, which had increased to such an extent, that on the 14th of February it amounted to 565,000*l.*; that of this sum 200,000*l.* was sold on February the 16th, and 115,000*l.* on February the 17th; that the remaining sum of 250,000*l.* was sold on the morning of February the 21st: that out of this sum of 250,000*l.* it was stated by Mr. Cochrane Johnstone, that 50,000*l.* was for a friend of his; and he consented to be a guarantee for any loss which might accrue: that he does not know Lord Cochrane or Mr. Butt.

"Mr. SMALLBONE, a stockbroker, stated that he had bought (a few days prior to February the 21st) 40,000*l.* Omnium for Mr. Cochrane Johnstone, and 40,000*l.* Omnium for Mr. Butt; both these were sold in the morning of February the 21st.; that the bargains were made for the next settling-day, and not for money.

"Mr. J. M. RICHARDSON (a bookseller, but occasionally acting as a stockbroker) stated, that on the afternoon of Saturday, February the 19th, Mr. Butt applied to him to buy 150,000*l.* Omnium for the next settling-day; that he had once purchased 20,000*l.* Omnium for him, and gained 5-8ths per cent. on the transaction; but that he declined entering on so large a speculation as the one now proposed: that, however, he did purchase 30,000*l.* Omnium for him as he requested; and that he sold it on the morning of February the 21st.

"[From these statements it appears, that *on the afternoon of Saturday, February the* 19th, the three parties above-mentioned may *be considered as having purchased* for the next settling-days the following sums, viz.—

	Omnium.	Consols.
Lord Cochrane - - -	£139,000	None.
Hon. A. C. Johnstone -	410,000	£100,000
Mr. Butt - - - - -	224,000	168,000
Total - -	£773,000	£268,000

The whole of which was sold on the morning of Monday, February the 21st.]"

As the whole of the preceding "*evidences*" relate to the sums of money said to have been purchased and sold by Lord Cochrane, the Hon. Cochrane Johnstone, and Mr. Butt, they are, for the sake of their strong connection, left in the same arrangement in which they appear in the Report of the Sub-Committee. How far that Report affords a fair and honourable elucidation of facts, is left to the judgment of the candid reader, upon whom we shall now intrude, by soliciting his calm and dispassionate attention to the following distinct analysis of the points upon which the Sub-Committee have formed their combined and aggregate statement; with some comments upon their general and artfully-blended deductions. In the first place, therefore, by way of prefatory remark, it is requisite to notice, that the Sub-Committee have dwelt with particular emphasis on the aggregate purchases of the *whole* of the parties whom they design to implicate, whereby to add some apparent force to their assumptions, which these accounts taken distinctly could not effect.

That Lord Cochrane sold 139,000*l.* Omnium, on the 21st of February, is readily acceded to as true. But as this statement of the Sub-Committee was designed to be understood as disclosing the truth in its legal and moral definition, of including not only *the truth* as far as it went, but "*the whole truth*" and "*nothing but the truth*"—it seems rather remarkable, that they should

have omitted to notice, that this 139,000*l.* was the remaining part of 206,000*l.* which his Lordship had purchased for the account; 67,000*l.* of which had been sold, namely, 50,000*l.* on the 17th, and 17,000*l.* on the 19th—*that is on the very day on which the Stock-Exchange have felt it proper to observe, that 20,000l. was purchased.* By this it will appear, to any unprejudiced mind, that although Lord Cochrane did purchase 20,000*l.* Omnium on the 19th of February, as is asserted, he also *sold* 17,000*l.* of it *at a loss of* 1-8th *per cent. on the same day.* The 139,000*l.* sold on the 21st, was effected *by general order* given to the brokers, when they could sell at a profit, as is customary among gentlemen who employ others to transact their business, and are not able to watch the market themselves; and the sale of the 50,000*l.* on the 17th, was also made within that week in which *purchases* are alleged to have taken place under a fraudulent view.

But it must also be kept in mind, that the Sub-Committee, in their eagerness to fix the fraud upon these gentlemen, have omitted to state, that *previously* to the 21st of February Lord Cochrane had balanced his purchases and sales *in Consols "for the account,"* and which amounted to 150.000*l.!* As it did not conduce to the object which they had in view, this *Consol* account was indeed *passed over unnoticed;* but as the 206.000*l. Omnium* already referred to, and this 150.000*l. Consols* formed together the sum of 356.000*l.* for the account, it would have been only candid to have stated, that the 139.000*l. Omnium* sold on the 21st, was merely the

residue of what had been purchased in Omnium and Consols, instead of being, *as is implied*, a sum actually bought in meditation of the fraud, and sold in consequence of the artificial rise thereby produced.

So much for Stock-Exchange liberality, and correctness in the elucidation of accounts before them!

That the public may, however, judge of this with more certainty, we subjoin a copy of the account itself, so that no misconception may arise, that we, like the Stock-Exchange Committee, can be capable of giving an artful colouring to facts, so as to render them *directly false* in their application. — Lord Cochrane's account is

	BOUGHT.		SOLD.
1814.	£	1814.	£
Feb. 14.	100,000 at 28¼	Feb. 17.	50,000 at 27½
16.	12,000 - 26⅞	19.	17,000 - 27½
—	38,000 - 27⅛	21.	66,000 - 29¼
18.	6,000 - 28	—	8,000 - 29⅜
—	13,000 - 27¾	—	58,000 - 29½
—	16,000 - 27	—	7,000 - 30½
—	1,000 - 26⅞		
19.	20,000 - 27⅝		£206,000
	£206,000		

After having thus afforded the reader an opportunity of deciding, whether the Stock-Exchange Committee meant to deal candidly, either by Lord Cochrane or the public, to whom they appealed, we shall proceed to the accounts of sale of *Omnium*, and *Consols*, for the Hon. Cochrane Johnstone on the 21st, which the Sub-Committee accurately state to have amounted to 120,000*l.* of the former, and 100,000*l.* of the latter.

Although it will be seen, that the Sub-Committee were correct in their statement of the amount sold on the 21st of February,—it is proper to call attention to the fact, which these gentlemen have, from some cause, omitted to notice, namely, that the 120,000*l.* Omnium, was the *remaining* part of 427,000*l.*—with the exception of 10,000*l.* which actually *remained unsold*—that had been purchased for the account, out of which latter, 297,500*l.* had been *previously disposed* of:—and further, that 19,500*l.* of it was sold on the 17th, and 18,000*l.* on the 19th, *or the pretended day of assumed fraudulent purchases.* These two latter sums, it should be remembered, make together, within 500*l.* of the 38,000*l.* (not 60,000*l.* as asserted by the Sub-Committee) purchased on the 18th, or the day insisted upon, as one on which the preparatory increase of stock had been made for Mr. Johnstone; and the sale on the 21st was, as the Sub-Committee must have been aware, the mere balancing, at an accidentally favourable opportunity, of the *jobbing account for a month.*

That the implied "*magnitude*" of the sale upon this 21st of February, may not give colour to the insinuations of the Sub-Committee, it is requested, that attention may be given to the circumstance of 105,000*l.* having, during this account, and prior to the period of imputed fraud, been sold on *one day*, namely, the 10th of February; and also, that 100,000*l.* was sold on the 14th, or the first day of the week in which the Sub Committee state "*most*

of the sums brought forward by them had been purchased!"

Mr. Johnstone's Omnium account to the 21st of February inclusive, is

1814.	BOUGHT.	1814.	SOLD.
Feb. 8,	5,000 at 20 3/8	Feb. 9,	10,000 at 21
—	5,000 - 20 5/8	10,	42,000 - 22 1/4
9,	47,000 - 20 7/8	—	5,000 - 22 3/8
10,	14,000 - 21 1/4	—	57,000 - 23
—	44,000 - 21 7/8	—	1,000 - 23 1/8
—	20,000 - 24	11,	20,000 - 26 1/8
11,	10,000 - 24 1/4	—	15,000 - 26
—	5,000 - 25 1/4	14,	50,000 - 28 1/4
—	23,000 - 26 1/8	—	28,500 - 28 1/2
—	15,000 - 26 1/4	—	21,500 - 28 7/8
—	3,500 - 26 1/2	16,	6,000 - 27 1/4
—	31,000 - 26 3/8	—	4,000 - 27 1/8
—	27,500 - 26 3/4	17,	19,500 - 27 1/2
14,	21,500 - 29	19,	18,000 - 27 1/2
—	19,000 - 28 7/8	21,	57,000 - 29 1/4
—	30,000 - 28 5/8	—	6,000 - 29 3/8
—	4,000 - 28 1/2	—	48,000 - 29 1/2
—	6,000 - 28 1/4	—	8,000 - 30 1/2
—	16,000 - 28	—	1,000 - 30 1/4
15,	3,500 - 28 3/8		
—	10,000 - 28 1/4		£417,500
—	10,000 - 26 5/8		
16,	6,000 - 27 1/8		
—	2,500 - 27		
17,	10,000 - 27 1/8		
—	1,000 - 26 5/8		
18,	7,000 - 28		
—	13,000 - 27 1/4		
—	17,000 - 27		
—	1,000 - 26 7/8		
	£427,500		

The *Consol* account will be found, still less than the *Omnium* account, to warrant the inferences of the Sub-Committee.

BOUGHT.		SOLD.	
1814.		1814.	
Jan. 29,	20,000 at 67¾	Feb. 9,	10,000 at 67¼
31,	10,000 - 67¼	—	10,000 - 67½
—	10,000 - 67⅜	—	10,000 - 67⅝
Feb. 7,	10,000 67	10,	20,000 - 68⅝
12,	43,000 - 71⅞	21,	15,000 - 71⅞
—	5,500 - 72	—	85,000 - 72
—	10,000 - 71¾		
—	28,500 - 72		£150,000
—	6,500 - 72⅛		
—	6,500 - 72¼		
	£150,000		

By examining this statement, it will be seen that the total purchase for the account was 150,000*l.*, of which 50,000*l.* had been sold *prior* to the 21st of February; that not one pound had been purchased, instead of *most of it*, "in the course of the week preceding;" and that, of the 100,000*l.* alluded to, which was sold on the 21st of February, part had been bought beyond the *highest price* at which it was disposed of; part at the same price; and none at a greater difference than ¼th per cent!

Having offered a few remarks upon the manner in which the Committee of the Stock-Exchange have submitted to the public, what, under the head of "*evidence*," they wished to be deemed a fair elucidation of *facts*, as regards Lord Cochrane and Mr. Cochrane Johnstone—we shall exhibit, that in their allusions to Mr. Butt's account, as little, or even less, candour has been shewn towards him, or respect to the public, whom they have essayed to deceive, in order to raise that prejudice which they well

knew could alone uphold their unfounded allegations, and grossly-false conclusions. Mr. Butt's Omnium account is,

1814.	BOUGHT.	1814.	SOLD.
Feb. 8,	5,000 at 20 3/8	Feb. 9,	10,000 at 21
9,	20,000 - 20 7/8	10,	50,000 - 22 1/4
—	20,000 -	—	45,000 - 23
—	10,000 -	—	10,000 - 23 1/8
10,	14,000 - 21 1/4	—	5,000 - 23 1/4
—	30,000 - 21 7/8	11	25,000 - 26 7/8
—	10,000 -	—	8,000 - 26
—	4,000 -	14,	50,000 - 28 1/4
—	20,000 - 24	—	28,500 - 28 1/2
11,	23,000 - 26 7/8	—	21,500 - 28 1/4
—	10,000 - 24 3/4	16,	6,000 - 27 1/4
—	5,000 - 25 1/4	—	4,000 - 27 1/8
—	15,000 - 26 1/4	17,	19,500 - 27 1/2
—	3,500 - 26 1/2	19,	18,000 - —
—	31,000 - 26 3/4	21,	73,000 - 29 1/4
—	27,500 - 26 3/4	—	6,000 - 29 3/8
14,	21,500 - 29	—	64,000 - 29 1/2
—	19,000 - 28 7/8	—	10,000 - 30 1/8
—	30,000 - 28 5/8	—	1,000 - —
—	4,000 - 28 1/2		£454,500
—	6,000 - 28 1/4		
—	16,000 - 28		
15,	3,500 - 28 3/8		
—	10,000 - 28 1/4		
16,	10,000 - 26 5/8		
—	6,000 - 27 1/8		
—	2,500 - 27		
17,	10,000 - 27 1/8		
—	1,000 - 26 5/8		
18,	7,000 - 28		
—	13,000 - 27 3/8		
—	17,000 - 27		
—	1,000 - 26 7/8		
	£430,500		

By the preceding account it will be seen, that the Sub-Committee have truly stated, that 154,000*l.* was sold on the 21st February; but it will also be manifest, that the fact has been concealed, of its being only the unsold part of the 430,500*l.*, to which the account for the settlement amounted. It will also appear, that 177,500*l.* had been purchased in the previous week, alluded to by the Committee: But, fortunately, it will further appear, that 147,500*l.* had been *sold* (as well as this 177,500*l.* purchased) in that week, though the sum sold, is *forgotten* to be noticed by the Sub-Committee, in their eagerness to impress, that the purchases had been made to meet the fraud on the 21st!!

So much for Stock-Exchange *unreservedness and candour* in the statement of facts! To which, let us here add what, by some means, is omitted in their Report, that of the sum sold in the week, 18,000*l.* of it was so disposed of on the 19th, i. e. the *precise day when they imply, that the parties accused were preparing for the accomplishment of the intended fraud on the 21st!!!* Upon the circumstance of the Sub-Committee having thus omitted the facts that militate against their suspicions, much might be said; but a discerning public, with the accounts before them, will readily see, that had the *entire facts* been disclosed, *before a prejudice was* excited, no person would or could, for one moment, have been misled.

Mr. Butt's *Consol* account, when examined by an impartial public, will, in like manner as the *Omnium*

account, shew, that not one of the conclusions nor implications of the Sub-Committee, is supported by fact, or sound reasoning.

BOUGHT.		SOLD.	
1814.		1814.	
Jan. 20,	19,000 at 67⅛	Jan. 21,	30,000 at 66½
—	30,000 - 67¼	22,	20,000 - 66⅝
—	26,000 - 67⅜	24,	10,000 - 66⅝
—	25,000 - 67½	26,	20,000 - 67¼
25,	20,000 - 67	—	20,000 - 67⅜
—	20,000 - 66⅞	29	40,000 - 67⅝
29,	20,000 - 67¾	Feb. 9,	10,000 - 67¼
31,	10,000 - 67¼		10,000 - 67½
—	10,000 - 67⅜		10,000 - 67⅝
Feb. 7,	10,000 - 67	10,	20,000 - 68⅝
11,	46,000 - 71	12,	20,000 - 72
12,	30,000 - 71⅞	19,	20,000 - 70½
—	10,000 - 71¾	—	10,000 - 70⅝
—	5,500 - 72	21,	10,000 - 70⅛
—	28,500 - 72	—	23,000 - 71¼
—	6,500 - 72⅛	—	20,000 - 71⅞
—	6,500 - 72¼	—	75,000 - 72
15,	55,000 - 71⅛	—	40,000 - 72¼
16,	20,000 - 70⅛		
—	20,000 - 70½		
	£418,000		£408,000

The Sub-Committee state, that 168,000*l.* consols were sold on the 21st of February, "most of which had been purchased in the course of the week preceding." It is true, that these 168,000*l.* were sold, and further, that 95,000*l.* were purchased in the week alluded to. But it will be seen, though *unnoticed* by the Sub-Committee, that in that week, *and even on the very day, the 19th, when the fraud is alleged to have been in meditation,* 30,000*l. had been sold!*

It will likewise appear, that the 168,000*l.* was only part of an account which reached the sum of 418,000*l.*; and of which, *prior* to the day of the fraud, 240,000*l.* had been sold.

The information stated to have been received from Mr. Hichens is correct, as far as it goes.—Mr. Richardson's "*evidence*," as it is given by the Sub-Committee, shall be next investigated.

Mr. Richardson is affirmed to have stated, "that on the afternoon of Saturday, February 19, Mr. Butt applied to him to buy 150,000*l.* Omnium for the next settling-day; that he had *once* purchased 20,000*l.* Omnium for him, and gained 5-8ths per cent. on the transaction; but that he declined entering on so large a speculation as the one now proposed: that, however, he did purchase 30,000*l.* Omnium for him, as he requested; and that he sold it on the morning of February the 21st."

Before offering any observation upon this alleged "*evidence*" of Mr. Richardson, we have earnestly to solicit that it may be perused with attention, when doubtless the reader will understand it, as most others have done, and as it was intended they should, *that Mr. Butt wished this "evidence" to purchase for him a sum which he did not think it prudent to risk, because he had only* one *dealing with him before, at some distant period, and that to the extent of* only 20,000*l.* *But that, being induced by a consideration of the profit that accrued from that distant and sole purchase, he was led to buy* 30,000*l.* *on the* 19*th, which, being sold on the* 21*st, went*

in proof that it had been bought expressly for sale on the day of the fraud!!!

Mr. Richardson's account, which commenced on the 19th of February, and ended on the 14th of March, is as follows :—

1814.	BOUGHT.	1814.	SOLD.
Feb. 19,	10,000 at 27⅛	Feb. 19,	20,000 at 27½
—	5,000 - —	21,	30,000 - 28¼
—	5,000 - —	24,	10,000 - 29
—	10,000 - 27⅛	—	10,000 - 29
—	10,000 - 27½	25	10,000 - 28¾
—	10,000 - 27½	March 14,	25,000 - 26¾
23	20,000 - 28¾	—	5,000 - 26¾
24	10,000 - 29¼		
—	10,000 - 29¼	Balance £437 10*s.*	
25	20,000 - 28½		

By this account it will appear, that instead of Mr. Richardson having purchased only 30,000*l.* on the 19th, he had purchased in different sums, to the extent of 50,000*l.*, *of which* 20,000*l. was sold on the same day*, at a profit of 3-8ths—*not* "5-8ths;" but that, to make the case *appear* against Mr. Butt, this fact of purchase and sale of the 20,000*l.* out of the 50,000*l.*, is so worded as to convey, that they had taken place at some distant period, not comprehended in the account for that settlement. The statement of the Sub-Committee, as respects the 150,000*l.* which Mr. Butt is said to have ordered of Mr. Richardson is, like all the rest, although in fact true, incorrect as worded by them. Mr. Richardson was ordered to buy the smaller sum, which he was proceeding to effect, remarking, however, that the

fluctuations were great, and that "we must be careful." To that Mr. Butt answered, he was aware of it, and did not care if it were A HUNDRED and 50,000*l.* If this be a fair mode of submitting circumstances to the public, the Sub-Committee are welcome to the credit that will necessarily result from their candour. The remaining 30,000*l.* alluded to as having been disposed of on the day of the fraud, was sold at 28¼, being less than 3-4ths profit beyond the rate at which it had been purchased: and yet is this sale more than implied to have been provided for, under fraudulent circumstances!

Upon the total balance of this account, it will be seen that Mr. Butt *lost and paid* to the Stock-Exchange the sum of 437*l.* 10s. instead of having been a gainer; and it may not be unimportant for the public to know, that although his profits upon the account to the 21st, were diverted and withheld from him, by the orders of the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange, he nevertheless did not suffer that circumstance to operate against the payment of his balances at the final settlement of the account. The correspondence which passed on this point is, for the sake of making this fact more evident, here transcribed:—

Mr. Richardson says:—

"I do myself the honour of sending you a statement of account for the present payment of Omnium, which I trust you will find correct. I regret that the balance turns out

greater than I thought it had been when I saw you. I shall feel obliged by your draft on Wednesday morning.

" I remain, &c.

(Signed) J. M. RICHARDSON."

" *March* 14, 1814.

Mr. Butt acknowledges the receipt of this letter in the following terms:—

" SIR,

" I have received your letter, enclosing my account with you, stating a balance of four hundred and odd pounds due by me to you. Although I might most justly refuse to pay it, as the members of the Stock-Exchange have stopped the balance due to me, still their conduct will not induce me to do a dishonourable act by following the plan adopted by them; I therefore wish you to call upon me to-morrow morning, at No. 5, Shorter's-court, when I will give you a draft for the amount.

" I am, Sir,

" Your humble servant,

" 14*th* *March*, 1814. " R. G. BUTT."

Although the bare exposure of the disingenuous manner, in which the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange have noticed the facts, of the purchases and sales of the sums on the 19th and 21st of February, will be sufficient to satisfy any honest mind, that unjustifiable means have been resorted to, designing to raise a clamour against Mr. Butt; yet, the dexterity of that body may be displayed to endeavour to explain away the allusion that Mr. Richardson had only *once* before purchased 20,000*l.* for him, and to lay some stress upon the account having commenced on the 19th of February. It is, therefore, expedient to say that Mr. Richardson,

instead of having had only *one* transaction with Mr. Butt, had, as partner with Mr. Fearn (then *Fearn and Richardson*) been in the habit of transacting business for him for a very considerable period; that he had frequently, since the dissolution of that partnership, which happened only a few months since, solicited a continuance of part of Mr. Butt's orders, which was promised to him; and that, from the fluctuation of the funds on the 19th, Mr. Butt thought it a proper opportunity of commencing an account, by ordering the purchase of 50,000*l.*—20,000*l.* of which was sold the same day.

The alleged "*Evidence*" having been gone through, we have now arrived at that part of the Sub-Committee's Report, which may be deemed the summing up of the whole. And although it is asserted by these gentlemen, that they did not design to offer any "comments,*" it would be difficult to designate what they have there advanced, by any other expression. "*From these statements,*" they say, "*it appears, that on the afternoon of Saturday, February the 19th, the three parties above-mentioned may be considered as having purchased, for the next settling-days, the following sums, viz.*—

	Omnium.	Consols.
"Lord Cochrane . .	£139.000	None.
"Hon. A. C. Johnstone	410.000	100.000
"Mr. Butt	224.000	168.000
	£773.000	£268.000

* See page 9.

"*The whole of which was sold on the morning of Monday, February the 21st.*"

When the public read this, an impression must be felt by them, that with a view to fraud, these parties had prepared themselves for its operation, by purchases to this amount, *on the 19th instant;* but the Sub-Committee, in this general statement, as they have done in detail, have omitted to notice, that these sums, belonging to each party, were the totals that *remained unsold* at the close of the market on the 19th instant, *on which day* they had sold largely; making a total of sales, *to the* 19th inclusive, of 995,500*l.* Omnium, and 525,000*l.* Consols, out of the amount of the whole of their accounts, for the settling-day; of which sums there are some noticed, and some *not*, by the Sub-Committee. The aggregate of the accounts of these three gentlemen amounted to 1,768,500*l.* Omnium, and 793,000*l.* Consols; the whole of which might have been reserved and sold on the 21st, had any object been in view, for that day, as readily as the portion that really was sold. The sudden rise that took place, enabled the brokers to comply with their orders to close the respective accounts while the profit was certain, and in their anxiety to do so, they lost the opportunity of gaining fort heir employers a large per centage on the transaction.

The accounts alluded to as *not having been mentioned by the Committee,* are those *which had been balanced by sales* during the period when *imputed* fraudulent purchases were asserted

to be making. They will, of course, be produced before a proper tribunal; and are here alluded to, only to prevent the possibility of insidious observations being advanced, that *any* facts are concealed, and from that cause afford opportunity for recrimination, as to want of candour.

We cannot have the slightest apprehension, but that all those who are not interested in supporting the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange, will, upon examining the accounts themselves, form a very different conclusion from that which they may have done, on a perusal of the observations of the Sub-Committee upon those accounts; and it is only necessary to intreat, that the public will not suffer themselves to be misled by *ex-parte* statements into a prejudication of the case, but suspend their judgment until legal investigation shall preclude the possibility of any misrepresentation.

APPENDIX A.

LORD COCHRANE'S AFFIDAVIT.

HAVING obtained leave of absence to come to town in consequence of scandalous paragraphs in the public papers; and in consequence of having learnt that hand-bills had been affixed in the streets, in which (I have since seen) it is asserted that a person came to my house, at No. 13, Green-street, on the 21st day of February, in open day, and in the dress in which he had committed a fraud, I feel it due to myself to make the following deposition, that the public may know the truth relative to the only person seen by me in military uniform at my house on that day. COCHRANE.

13, *Green-street*, *March* 11, 1814.

No. 13, *Green-street*, *Grosvenor-street*,
March 11, 1814.

I, Sir THOMAS COCHRANE, commonly called Lord Cochrane, having been appointed by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to active service (at the request, I believe, of Sir Alexander Cochrane), when I had no expectation of being called on, I obtained leave of absence to settle my private affairs previous to quitting this country, and chiefly with a view to lodge a specification to a patent relative to a discovery for increasing the intensity

of light. That in pursuance of my daily practice of superintending work that was executing for me, and knowing that my uncle, Mr. Cochrane Johnstone, went to the City every morning in a coach, I do swear, on the morning of the 21st of February (which day was impressed on my mind by circumstances which afterwards occurred, I breakfasted with him at his residence in Cumberland-street, about half-past eight o'clock, and I was put down by him (and Mr. Butt was in the coach) on Snow-hill, about ten o'clock. That I had been about three-quarters of an hour at Mr. King's manufactory, at No. 1, Cock-lane, when I received a few lines on a small bit of paper, requesting me to come immediately to my house; the name affixed, from being written close to the bottom, I could not read; the servant told me it was from an army officer: and concluding that he might be an officer from Spain, and that some accident had befallen to my brother, I hastened back, and I found Captain Berenger, who, in great seeming uneasiness, made many apologies for the freedom he had used, which nothing but the distressed state of his mind, arising from difficulties, could have induced him to do. All his prospects, he said, had failed, and his last hope had vanished of obtaining an appointment in America. He was unpleasantly circumstanced on account of a sum which he could not pay; and if he could, that others would fall upon him for full 8000*l*. He had no hope of benefiting his creditors in his present situation, or of assisting himself. That if I would take him with me, he would immediately go on board and exercise the sharpshooters (which plan Sir Alexander Cochrane, I knew, had approved of). That he had left his lodgings, and prepared himself in the best way his means allowed. He had brought the sword with him, which had been his father's; and to that, and to Sir Alexander, he would trust for obtaining an honourable

appointment. I felt very uneasy at the distress he was in, and knowing him to be a man of great talent and science, I told him I would do every thing in my power to relieve him; but as to his going immediately to the Tonnant, with any comfort to himself, it was quite impossible: my cabin was without furniture; I had not even a servant on board. He said he would willingly mess any where. I told him that the ward-room was already crowded; and, besides, I could not, with propriety, take him, he being a foreigner, without leave from the Admiralty. He seemed greatly hurt at this, and recalled to my recollection certificates which he had formerly shewn me from persons in official situations: Lord Yarmouth, General Jenkinson, and Mr. Reeves, I think, were amongst the number. I recommended him to use his endeavour to get them, or any other friends, to exert their influence, for I had none; adding, that when the Tonnant went to Portsmouth, I should be happy to receive him; and I knew from Sir Alexander Cochrane, that he would be pleased if he accomplished that object. Captain Berenger said, that not anticipating any objection on my part from the conversation he had formerly had with me, he had come away with intention to go on board, and make himself useful in his military capacity; he could not go to Lord Yarmouth, or to any other of his friends, in this dress (alluding to that which he had on), or return to his lodgings, where it would excite suspicion (as he was at that time in the Rules of the King's Bench); but that if I refused to let him join the ship now, he would do so at Portsmouth. Under present circumstances, however, he must use a great liberty, and request the favour of me to lend him a hat to wear instead of his military cap. I gave him one, which was in a back room with some things that had not been packed up, and having tried it on, his uniform appeared under his great coat; I there-

fore offered him a black coat that was laying on a chair, and which I did not intend to take with me. He put up his uniform in a towel, and shortly afterwards went away in great apparent uneasiness of mind; and, having asked my leave, he took the coach I came in, and which I had forgotten to discharge in the haste I was in. I do further depose, that the above conversation is the substance of all that passed with Captain Berenger, which, from the circumstances attending it, was strongly impressed upon my mind: that no other person in uniform was seen by me at my house, on Monday, the 21st of February, though possibly other officers may have called (as many have done since my appointment); of this, however, I cannot speak of my own knowledge, having been almost constantly from home, arranging my private affairs. I have understood that many persons have called under the above circumstances, and have written notes in the parlour, and others have waited there in expectation of seeing me, and then gone away; but I most positively swear, that I never saw any person at my house resembling the description, and in the dress stated in the printed advertisement of the Members of the Stock-Exchange. I further aver, that I had no concern, directly or indirectly, in the late imposition, and that the above is all that I know relative to any person who came to my house in uniform on the 21st day of February before alluded to. Captain Berenger wore a grey great coat, a green uniform, and a military cap. From the manner in which my character has been attempted to be defamed, it is indispensibly necessary to state, that my connection in any way with the funds arose from an impression, that in the present favourable aspect of affairs, it was only necessary to hold stock, in order to become a gainer, without prejudice to any body; that I did so openly, considering it in no degree improper, far less dishonourable; that I had no secret information of

any kind; and that had my expectation of the success of affairs been disappointed, I should have been the only sufferer. Further I do most solemnly swear, That the whole of the Omnium on account, which I possessed on the 21st day of February, 1814, amounted to £139.000, which I bought by Mr. Fearn (I think) on the 12th ultimo, at a premium of 28¼; that I did not hold on that day any other sum on account, in any other stock, directly or indirectly; and that I had given orders, when it was bought, to dispose of it on a rise of one per cent., and it actually was sold on an average at 29½ premium, though on the day of the fraud it might have been disposed of at 33½. I further swear, That the above is the only stock which I sold of any kind on the 21st day of February, except £2000 in money, which I had occasion for, the profit of which was about £10. Further I do solemnly depose, That I had no connexion or dealing with any one, save the above-mentioned; and that I did not at any time, directly or indirectly, by myself, or by any other, take or procure any office or apartment for any broker, or other person, for the transaction of stock affairs.

COCHRANE.

APPENDIX B.

Lord Cochrane having read in the public prints the Report, and what is called the *Evidence*, taken by the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange, has lost no time in collecting Affidavits of his late and present servants relative to the circumstances in question, and also the affidavits of two gentlemen; whence he is satisfied the public will be convinced of the falsehood of the imputations cast on his character in the publication above-mentioned.

It is stated in the Sub-Committee's evidence (which was *not taken upon oath)*, that the officer who was taken to Lord Cochrane's house by Crane, the hackney-coachman, was dressed in a *brown* great coat and a *red* under coat. This is stated by Crane; and Shilling, the Dartford post-boy, gives the same description of the dress of the officer whom he put into the hackney-coach. In opposition to this, here are the affidavits (not the bare words) of Thomas Dewman, Isaac Davis, and Mary Turpin, (Nos. I. II. and III.) late and present servants of Lord Cochrane, who swore that Captain Berenger, or the person who came to the house on the day alluded to, and in consequence of whose arrival one of them went for Lord Cochrane, was dressed in a *grey* great coat, buttoned up, and that they saw a *green* collar of an under coat. Lord Cochrane, who saw the great coat taken off, has before sworn, that Captain Berenger's dress was, a *grey* great coat, a *green* uniform, and a military cap. Colours more opposite, more strongly contra-distinguishable, cannot be well imagined. How the Dartford post-boy and the hackney-coachman came so exactly *to agree* in a declaration so directly opposite to all these oaths, the public will be better able to guess, probably, by the time when all the curious *evidence* of the Sub-Committee shall have been examined and answered.

In the evidence of the Sub-Committee, it is represented to have been stated by Sayer, the police-officer, that he had "*ascertained* that the man-servant of Lord Cochrane had been *turned off*, and another hired, and that the servant who let in the pretended Du Bourgh had been *sent into the country*." From the affidavit of Isaac Davis, who was the servant said to have been turned off, it appears that he went away in consequence of a regular month's warning, which was given him when his master was appointed

to a ship. From the affidavit of Thomas Dewman it appears that he was hired by Lord Cochrane *expressly for the purpose of going to the country*, to supply the place of his Lordship's captain's steward, who was living at a residence of his Lordship's in the country; and the fact is, that he did so go, and the steward immediately came up to town; which was a few days before Lord Cochrane set off to join his ship at Chatham. Though, therefore, here really were one man *discharged*, and another *sent into the country*, a candid public will judge of the fairness of Sayer's representation, whence it must, as published by the Sub-Committee, evidently be inferred, that two servants were *put out of the way* with a view of getting rid of their evidence. The evidence of both is now offered to the public by him who had been, by insinuation, accused of a wish to smother it.

This Sayer, in the publication of the Sub-Committee, is stated to have said, that he had "*ascertained* that Lord Cochrane, his *brother*, and *three* or *four* more men, lived in the house."—Every one must see that this description of his Lordship's house is calculated to produce an impression that he kept a sort of house of ill-fame. The deponents, Thomas Dewman, Isaac Davis, Mary Turpin, all positively swear, as will be seen by their affidavits, that *no man whatever* lived in the house, except his Lordship and his servants. Thus there are *three oaths*, proving that what Sayer (as the Sub-Committee say) had *ascertained* to be true, was *false*, and utterly destitute of the smallest *colour* of truth. The Public will, it is imagined, want little more to give them a correct notion of the nature of that *evidence*, as it is called, to which the Sub-Committee have dared to give such extensive circulation.

Of the means which have been resorted to, in order to obtain evidence on this subject, the Public will be able to

form an idea from the second affidavit of Mary Turpin (No. IV.) whence it will be seen, that she was inveigled out of her master's house, and had *money tendered to her*, in the most artful manner, by persons unknown to her, if she would give them information. The scheme did not succeed, and, as it happened, it would have been of no consequence if it had; but the attempt, in this instance, serves as a criterion whereby to judge of the whole series of acts perpetrated against the character of Lord Cochrane.

To these affidavits, which relate to the *evidence*, as it is daringly called, of the Sub-Committee, are added two others; one of which (No V.) is from Mr. Thomas, successor to Messrs. Binns and Co. (which firm has continued in their name for these hundred years) and has been called forth by a paragraph which appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*.—This paragraph stated, in very positive terms, *that the Napoleons expended on the road by the pretended Du Bourgh were purchased at Mr. Binns's by a draft of Lord Cochrane upon his bankers.* This was, to be sure, an assertion, the boldness of which was calculated to be decisive with persons who did not reflect, that, unless the sellers of the Napoleons had taken the precaution to put a private mark upon them, the fact was impossible to be ascertained. But here is subjoined an affidavit of Mr. Thomas, the successor of Binns and Co. (whose *name*, as before observed, only remains in the house), denying the fact, in the most positive manner, and in the clearest and most comprehensive terms; for Mr. Thomas swears, that he not only never sold any foreign coin to Lord Cochrane, but also, that he never in his life had any transaction with his Lordship, and never received any draft to which his Lordship's name was affixed.—What *ground*, what *colour*, could there have been, then, for this bold and unqualified assertion in the *Morning Chronicle?* It is clear, that the assertion was not only *false*, but that there was not the

smallest *colour* for it; that there was no circumstance, no *possible* circumstance, whereon to build an *erroneous* conclusion. So that the whole story must have been absolutely an *invention*. With whom such an invention could originate, and from what sort of *motive*, and for what *purpose*, the public must be left to judge; but that public should also be informed, that, in the very same paper in which this paragraph appeared, there appeared an advertisement, addressed to the Electors of the city of Westminster, for which it is well known that Lord Cochrane is one of the Members of Parliament, requesting them to suspend their choice of a new Member, as a "gentleman of *pure* honour, integrity, and good character, meant to offer the moment the *vacancy* was declared."

Some weight has been given to the circumstance, that, when the suspected hoaxer arrived at the house of Lord Cochrane, the latter's servant knew, at once, where to go after him, with the officer's note, and find him. His Lordship has before stated, on his oath, that he was at Mr. King's manufactory, where some work was executing for him, in the completion of which he was very anxious; and that he was in the daily habit of going to Mr. King's. Mr. King's affidavit, (No. VI.) is subjoined, to prove that his Lordship *was* at his manufactory when the servant came to him with the officer's note; and this also proves, that that part of the evidence, or mis-named evidence, published by the Sub-Committee, which states, as from the lips of Mr. Fearn, that Lord Cochrane went to Mr. Fearn's office, in the city, along with Mr. Cochrane Johnstone and Mr. Butt, in the morning of the hoax, is untrue.

No. I.

I, Thomas Dewman, do swear, that I was hired by Lord Cochrane expressly for the purpose of going to the country, and that about two days before I went down to

relieve his Lordship's steward, several gentlemen called upon his Lordship, as was the case daily. And further, that to the best of my recollection and belief, on Monday, the 21st day of February, a gentleman came in a hackney-coach, and finding his Lordship out, desired to go in and write a note, which he did in the parlour. He asked when his Lordship had gone out, and I told him he had gone to Cumberland-street to breakfast. I came back and acquainted the gentleman that his Lordship had gone into the city, and that it was most likely he would not be back before dinner-time. He said, his business was pressing, and asked if it was possible to find him; I replied, I was not certain, but I thought I might; and I went to Mr. King's tin-manufactory in Cock-lane, where I delivered the note to his Lordship. The officer who sent me to the city wore a grey regimental great-coat buttoned up; I saw a green collar underneath it; he had a black silk stock or handkerchief round his neck; he was of a middle size, and rather of a dark complexion. Several gentlemen called in the morning, but this was the only one that I saw in uniform at his Lordship's house, in which no man lived (as I have seen stated by Sayer, the police-officer,) except his Lordship and his servants. And I further depose, that I never saw Mr. Cochrane Johnstone or Mr. Butt in his Lordship's house, at No. 13, in Green-street, from the time he entered it, until the time I left London, nor any person dressed as described by Crane, the hackney-coachman. And this deponent also swears, that the above statement contains all that he knows about the matter.

THOMAS DEWMAN.

Sworn at the Mansion-house, London,
this 21st day of March, 1814.

W. Domville, Mayor.

No. II.

I, ISAAC DAVIS, do swear, That I was in Lord Cochrane's service. That when his Lordship was appointed to a ship, I received warning to provide myself with a place; and that on the 21st day of February, when the month's warning had expired, I was in his Lordship's house in Green-street, where several gentlemen called in the morning, one of whom was Captain Berenger. He had on a grey great-coat, buttoned, and a green collar under it. I knew him, having seen him when his Lordship lived in Park-street. And I do further swear, that no man lived in his Lordship's house but his servants; and that I did not see any man dressed, or answering the description of Crane, the hackney-coachman, at his Lordship's house on the day above-mentioned. ISAAC DAVIS.

Sworn at the Mansion-house, London,
this 21st day of March, 1814.
W. Domville, Mayor.

No. III.

I, MARY TURPIN, do swear, That I lived as cookmaid with Lord Cochrane, and that I saw an officer in the parlour at Lord Cochrane's house in Green-street, on Monday morning the 21st of February last, when I went into the parlour for the purpose of mending the fire, and that the said officer had on a grey great-coat and a sword, and that his under-coat or his great-coat had a green collar to it. And that he staid in the said house (as I verily believe) until his Lordship's return. And I further swear, that no men whatever have lived in the said house with Lord Cochrane except his servants. And this is all that I know as to the above matter. MARY TURPIN.

Sworn at the Mansion-house, London,
this 21st day of March, 1814.
W. Domville, Mayor.

No. IV.

I, MARY TURPIN, now maid-servant with Lord Cochrane, do swear, That on Friday, the 18th of March instant, between the hours of one and two o'clock of the forenoon of the said day, a boy, servant to Mr. Collingwood, green-grocer, in Green-street, Grosvenor-square, came to me and informed me, that a lady wanted to speak to me at his master's house. That I went thither immediately, and found a lady standing just within the street-door of Mr. Collingwood's. That the said lady told me that a gentleman in the street wanted to speak to me. That I went to the gentleman, who took me a few yards on to the corner of North Audley-street. That the gentleman asked me what sort of uniform the person wore who came to Lord Cochrane's house, about three weeks ago. That I, thinking it wrong to give him any information at all, told him that I could not tell him; "Oh! yes, you can," said he, "if you choose;" and if you will, I will give you five pounds." That the gentleman repeated this offer five or six times. That I did not take any money from him. That he then went away with the lady. That the lady stood by, within hearing of the conversation, but said nothing.

MARY TURPIN.

Sworn at Guildhall, London, 22d day
of March, before me,
William Domville, Mayor.

No. V.

I, SAMUEL THOMAS, successor to Messrs. Binns and Co. swear, That I never sold, directly or indirectly, to the best of my knowledge, any foreign or other coin, as stated in the public papers, to Lord Cochrane; that I never had any transaction with his Lordship in my life;

nor did I ever receive any draft, to which his Lordship's name was affixed, for any purpose whatsoever.

SAMUEL THOMAS, successor to Binns and Co.
No. 102, Bank-buildings, Cornhill.

Sworn in the City of London, this 19th day of March, 1814, before me,
Samuel Goodbehere, Alderman.

No. VI.

I, WILLIAM ROBERT WALE KING, of No. 1, Cock-lane, Snow-hill, manufacturer of tin and japanned ware, do swear, That on the morning of the 21st of February, 1814 (between ten and eleven o'clock, to the best of my recollection and belief), Lord Cochrane was at my manufactory in Cock-lane aforesaid, superintending the construction of his patent lanterns, and while he was there, received a note from his man, read it, and shortly after went away. W. R. W. KING.

Sworn at the Public-Office, Hatton-garden, the 21st day of March, 1814, before me,
Thomas Leach.

No. VII.

I, THOMAS CHRISTMAS, clerk to Mr. Fearn, stock-broker, do swear, that I never, at any time, received orders from Mr. Butt, or any other person, to conceal my having been employed by him to change bank-notes at Messrs. Bond, Pattisall, and Co.'s, or at any other place whatsoever: and that any appearance of hesitation on my part in answering the questions put to me by the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange, arose solely from timidity at my being so suddenly and unexpectedly called upon, not being yet seventeen years of age, and but a few

weeks engaged in business of any kind. That the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange bade me recollect my father's character, and conjured me not to tarnish his fair name, or words to that effect. That they then asked me, whether I had not been desired to conceal my having changed notes for Mr. Butt ; and that I answered, without the smallest hesitation, that I never had been desired to conceal my having done so, either for him or any other person.

THOMAS CHRISTMAS.

Sworn in the city of London, this 22d day of March, 1814, before me,

Samuel Goodbehere.

No. VIII.

I, RICHARD BUTLER, of Cheapside, do make oath, that I was at my Stock-broker's, Mr. Fearn's, at No 86, Cornhill, on the afternoon of Saturday, the 19th February, where Mr. Butt was present; that I was witness to Mr. Butt's giving change in small notes to some person in the office, who made that request of him in exchange for a large one. And I do further swear, that there were several persons in the office at the same time.

RICHARD BUTLER.

Sworn in the City of London, this 21st day of March, 1814, before me,

Samuel Goodbehere.

No. IX.

I, WILLIAM SMITH, servant to Baron de Berenger, do swear, that my master slept at home on Sunday, the twentieth of February, one thousand eight hundred and

fourteen, as I let him in about eleven o'clock at night; that he went out early next morning, as I went into his room between eight and nine o'clock, and found him gone out. I went out about nine o'clock, and did not return till three o'clock, being that day at my mother's, cleaning some pictures for her; and when I returned, I then found my master at home, and I went to him to ask if he wanted any thing; he desired me to get him some ale and a mutton-chop, which I did. I saw his grey military great-coat and his green drill dress, and a black coat, which I knew was not his, laying upon a chair in the room. He went out that day to dine, between five and six o'clock, and came home about eleven that night. He slept regularly at home all that week until Sunday, the twenty-seventh, when he went away in the evening, and desired me to carry a box of clothes with him to the Angel Inn, which I did, and I there left him, and have never seen him since: and this is all that I know about my master. WILLIAM SMITH.

Surry to wit.—Sworn before me, one of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the said county, the 24th March, 1814. *John Pinhorn.*

No. X.

I, ANN SMITH, female servant to Baron de Berenger, do swear, that my master came home about twelve o'clock on Monday, the twenty-first day of February, one thousand eight hundred and fourteen, in a hackney-coach; he had on a black coat; he had a bundle with him, which, to its appearance, contained his grey military great-coat and green uniform; he went out the same morning before breakfast, without my seeing him. And I do further swear, that I made his bed, and cleaned his room, as

usual, on the twenty-first day of February, which had been slept in; he always slept at home regularly, until Sunday, the twenty-seventh of February; and he went away that day, and I never have seen him since.

ANN SMITH.

Surry to wit.

Sworn before me, one of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the said County, the 24th of March, 1814,

John Pinhorn.

No. XI.

I, CORNELIUS BERRY, of Sweeting's-alley, Cornhill, stationer, do make oath, that Mr. Cochrane Johnstone and Mr. Butt were constantly at my shop, during the time Mr. Butt had his office there, by half-past nine or ten o'clock in the morning; and I do further state on oath, having seen the Report of the Sub-Committee of the Stock-Exchange, relative to the late fraud, seeming to intimate it was a singular circumstance those gentlemen being in the city so early as ten o'clock on the morning of the 21st of February, I think it but justice to them to come forward and declare what is herein stated by me.

CORNS. BERRY.

Sworn at the Guildhall of the City of London, this 22d day of March, 1814.

Wm. Domville, Mayor.

No. XII.

I, WILLIAM GIBSON, having read the Report of the Committee of the Stock-Exchange, relative to the late fraud, in which Report it is stated, as a circumstance of surprise, that Mr. Butt and Mr. Cochrane Johnstone

were at Mr. Fearn's office in Shorter's Court, by ten o'clock in the morning of the 21st of February; in justice to those gentlemen I do make oath, that during the time Mr. Fearn had his office at my shop, which he had until the afternoon of the 19th February, they were very frequently there by half-past nine and ten o'clock, at No. 86, Cornhill.

W. GIBSON.

Sworn at the Guildhall, London, this
22d day of March, 1814, before me,
Wm. Domville, Mayor.

No. XIII.

I, WILLIAM ADAMS, hackney-coachman, do swear, that I came with my coach to the door of Mr. Cochrane Johnstone, No. 18, Great Cumberland-street, on Monday, the 21st day of February, precisely at nine o'clock, having been engaged for eight days preceding (Sunday excepted) *at the same hour* of each day, to go to the Royal Exchange. That I did, upon the 21st day of February, take up two gentlemen, besides Mr. Cochrane Johnstone, at the said hour of nine o'clock, from his house, and that I was desired to go as usual to the Royal Exchange. That, when the carriage got to the bottom of *Snow-hill*, I put down one of the gentlemen, who I believe was *Lord Cochrane*, and I proceeded with Mr. Cochrane Johnstone and the other gentleman to the Royal Exchange, where I put them down.

(Signed) WM. ADAMS.

Sworn at the Public Office, Hatton-
Garden, the 23d day of March, 1814.
(Signed) *Thomas Leach.*

W. Lewis, Printer, St. John's Square, London.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 062406746